



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/542,024	04/03/2000	Reinaldo A. Bergamaschi	YOR-2000-0054	4105
35195	7590	10/07/2004	EXAMINER	
FERENCE & ASSOCIATES 400 BROAD STREET PITTSBURGH, PA 15143			LEVIN, NAUM B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2825	

DATE MAILED: 10/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/542,024

Applicant(s)

BERGAMASCHI ET AL.

Examiner

Naum B Levin

Art Unit

2825

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 July 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7-13 and 15-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,8-11 and 16-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4,5,7,12,13 and 15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 July 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is in response to application 09/542,024 and Amendment filed on 07/08/2004. Claims 1-5, 7-13 and 15-18 remain pending in the application.

Claims 6 and 14 have been canceled and Claims 1, 7, 10, 15 and 18 have been amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-3, 8-11 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Choukalos et al. (US Patent 6,425,109).

Choukalos discloses high level automatic core configuration including:

(1), (10), (18) A method system and computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for creating system of interconnecting cores in systems-on-chip, said method comprising the steps of (col.1, ll.14-36; col.7, ll.54-67; col.8, ll.30-36):

selecting/choosing at least two cores/chiplets/blocks to be interconnected, each core having at least one associated pin classified in terms of predetermined properties (col.3, ll.26-34; col.5, ll.43-51);

Art Unit: 2825

automatically assessing the compatibility/matching of at least one pin of at least one core with respect to at least one pin of at least one other core, wherein said assessing comprises performing a compatibility check to determine whether the pins of a given pair of pins are compatible with respect to at least one given property (col.4, ll.21-67; col.5, ll.1-25 and ll.52-67; col.6, ll.1-51); and

automatically interconnecting said cores via establishing at least one connection between at least one pair of compatible pins (col.4, ll.21-67; col.5, ll.1-25 and ll.52-67; col.6, ll.1-51);

(2) The method according to Claim 1, further comprising:

automatically assessing, subsequent to said interconnecting step, whether all pins are connected (col.6, ll.6-17);

if at least two pins are not connected, thereafter applying a protocol/algorithm/loop to establish at least one additional connection between at least one additional pair of compatible pins (col.6, ll.6-17);

(3), (11) The method further comprising, prior to said selecting step, classifying said cores and said pins in terms of predetermined properties (col.3, ll.55-67; col.4, ll.51-67; col.5, ll.1-25);

(8), (16) The method according to further comprising:

subsequent to said interconnecting step, automatically verifying whether the pins in at least one interconnected pair of pins have matching pin properties (col.6, ll.6-51);

(9), (17) The method according to further comprising:

prior to said verifying step, establishing a list of pin properties for which a match

between the pins in at least one pair of pins is required (col.4, ll.51-67; col.5, ll.1-25);

said verifying step comprising the step of referring to said list of pin properties to determine whether the pins in at least one interconnected pair of pins have matching pin properties (col.5, ll.42-51; col.7, ll.18-27).

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 4-5, 7, 12-13 and 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

4. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

The prior art of record fails to teach or suggest or render obvious:

A method system and computer-readable medium having
computer-executable instructions for creating system of interconnecting cores in
systems-on-chip, said method comprising the steps of:

selecting/choosing at least two cores/chiplets/blocks to be interconnected, each
core having at least one associated pin;

automatically assessing the compatibility/matching of at least one pin of at least
one core with respect to at least one pin of at least one other core;

automatically interconnecting said cores via establishing at least one connection
between at least one pair of compatible pins;

prior to said selecting step, encoding said properties as binary decision diagram
variables, wherein said assessing step comprises:

performing Boolean operations on said binary decision diagram variables to compare and match properties;

performing a compatibility check to determine whether the pins of a given pair of pins are compatible with respect to at least one given property;

performing a matching check to determine whether the pins of a given pair of pins exhibit equivalent values associated with at least one given property.

REMARKS

5. Examiner appreciates the detailed remarks offered by Applicant that clarify “predetermined properties”. However claims do not recite these specific particular limitations.

6. Mostly, the Applicant argues, “... Choukalos ... does not disclose using properties of pins to determine pin compatibility”.

Choukalos, for example, recites:” For each unconnected pin in the core, the HLCC proceeds to step 103 where it loops through all the pins on all the other cores that have not yet been selected and then proceeds to step 104 and checks to see if there is a pin link name that matches (col.5, ll.56-60).” It means that pin link name, which is property of pin, is used to check compatibility between pins.

In other example Choukalos provides, for example, more details properties of pins: “The PIN_NAME defines which pin in the chiplet the PCS refers to. The LINK_NAME defines the global net type to which the pin should be connected to. Pins with similar LINK_NAMEs are tied together if other tests allow it. The GROUP_ID defines a method by which pins may be grouped such that they are all treated as a

bundle to be tied to the same chiplet, such as in the example shown in FIGS. 3 and 4. (col.5, ll.13-20)"

Yet in other example Choukalos recites: " The method also comprises the steps of: determining for each pin of the cores whether the pin is part of a group of related pins; and using the connectivity program to match each group of related pins together when connecting the cores. The connectivity program is initialized by choosing a set of cores to be connected together, flagging external pins on the cores, and loading descriptive files containing the pin configuration structure and configuration rules." In other words Choukalos uses pin configuration structure and configuration rules ("properties") to match pins ("determine pin compatibility") (col.2, ll.17-31).

Choukalos also discloses, for example: " If the pin is in a special group ... all of the pins of the group are connected together one-by-one according to their link names. First, the pin is matched with the group control core and the common cores in step 110. The HLCC matches all of the group names together in the core it is connecting that pin group to (control core) and the core it is currently working on (common core). The HLCC then proceeds to step 111 where it loops on the controller group pins, and then to step 112 where it loops on the other core group pins to see if there are other cores that have the same groups. If so, a multiple fanout configuration will be made (col.6, ll.19-31)".

7. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Naum B Levin whose telephone number is 571-272-1898. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew S Smith can be reached on 571-272-1907. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

N L


VUTHE SIEK
PRIMARY EXAMINER